



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,934	04/14/2004	Jose Costa-Requena	944-004.048	7560
4955	7590	04/29/2008	EXAMINER	
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP			KRISHNAN, VIVEK V	
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5				
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MONROE, CT 06468			2145	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/29/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/824,934	COSTA-REQUENA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	VIVEK KRISHNAN	2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2004.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date July 19, 2004.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This is a Non-Final Office Action Correspondence in response to U.S. Application No. 10/824934 filed on April 14, 2004. Claims 1-17 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claims 1-17 are indefinite because it is unclear as to whether the limitation(s) within parentheses (for example: (22), (24), (11e), etc.) are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Furthermore, upon correction the applicant is required to clearly specify the abbreviations SIP, IMS, CSP, XCAP, and WV.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-11, 13, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0213537 A1 to Ingimundarson et al. (hereinafter "Ingimundarson").

6. As to Claims 1, 8, 9, and 16, Ingimundarson discloses a method, computer program product, apparatus, and system (referenced hereinafter as the method) for use by a relay server in enabling a user in one domain to perform a management operation on a group stored in another domain via a message according to a protocol used in the user domain and bearing a group command according to a group operation protocol used in the user domain, but indicating a group of a service provided in the other domain, the method comprising:

a step (22) of identifying the group command in the message (Ingimundarson; paragraphs 73-88, discloses identifying the group command in the message); and

a step (24) of determining whether the group command is mappable to one or more group commands in the other domain providing an approximate equivalent to the group operation provided by the identified group command, by comparing the identified group command with a predetermined list (11e) of mappable group commands indicating, for each mappable group command in the one domain, one or more group commands in the other domain (Ingimundarson; paragraphs 73-88, discloses determining whether the group command is mappable by comparing

the identified group command with a predetermined list of mappable group command of the other domain).

7. As to Claims 2 and 10, Ingimundarson discloses each and every limitation of Claims 1 and 9. Ingimundarson further discloses a step (25), performed if the identified group command is determined to be mappable to the other domain, of translating the message so as to be in a form used in the other domain, and substituting for the identified group command the one or more group commands in the other domain to which the identified group command is mappable, according to the predetermined list of mappable group commands (Ingimundarson; paragraphs 73-88, discloses translating the message to a form used in the other domain, and substituting for the identified group command the group command of the other domain to which it is mappable).

8. As to Claims 3 and 11, Ingimundarson discloses each and every limitation of Claims 1 and 9. Ingimundarson further discloses a step (23) of determining whether the group indicated in the message in the other domain is used by a service that is approximately equivalent to a service in the domain of the user, by comparing the service indicated in the message with a predetermined list (llf) of approximately equivalent services (Ingimundarson; paragraphs 73-88, discloses determining whether the identified group is used by a service equivalent to a service in the domain of the user using a predetermined list of approximately equivalent services).

9. As to Claims 4 and 12, Ingimundarson discloses each and every limitation of Claims 3 and 11. Ingimundarson further discloses a step (28), performed if the service is found to be

included in the list (llf) of approximately equivalent services and so has an approximate equivalent in the user domain using a corresponding type of group but also determining that the group command is not mappable, of copying to a group server hosting the corresponding type of group in the user domain the group in the other domain, followed by a step of binding the group to the approximately equivalent service in the user domain (Ingimundarson; paragraphs 73-88, discloses if an approximately equivalent service is found, binding the group to the approximately equivalent service. The group is already available in the user domain).

10. As to Claims 5 and 13, Ingimundarson discloses each and every limitation of Claims 3 and 11. Ingimundarson further discloses a step (27), performed if the service is not found to be included in the list (llf) of approximately equivalent services, of copying to a group server in the user domain the group in the other domain, followed by a step of notifying the user that the group is available in the user domain but user action is required to bind the group to a service (Ingimundarson; paragraphs 73-88 and 146-150, discloses if an approximately equivalent service is not found, notifying user that new mappings need to be defined. The group is already available in the user domain).

11. As to Claim 17, Ingimundarson discloses a UE device (15), comprising:  
means (15a) for providing a group command for managing a group in a destination domain different from the domain to which the UE device is subscribed but using a group command protocol prescribed for use in the domain to which the UE device is subscribed, the group command including information sufficient to identify the group in the destination domain

(Ingimundarson; paragraphs 73-88, discloses means for providing a group command with sufficient information to identify the group in the destination domain); and

means (15), responsive to a notice indicating the group command is not mappable to an approximately equivalent command in a destination domain, for providing in response a notice of same for display to a user, the notice indicating that the group information cannot be mapped properly because at least some of the group information is incompatible with group information in the destination domain (Ingimundarson; paragraphs 73-88 and 146-150, discloses that if the group command is not mappable, indicating to the user that new mappings need to be defined).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingimundarson as applied to Claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of 3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Core Network; IP Multimedia (IM) Subsystem Cx and Dx Interfaces; Signalling flows and message contents; (Release 5) to 3GPP (hereinafter "3GPP") and Wireless Village-The Mobile IMPS Initiative to Ericcson et al. (hereinafter "Ericcson").

14. As to Claims 6 and 14, Ingimundarson discloses each and every limitation of Claims 1 and 9. Ingimundarson further discloses wherein one of the domains is 3GPP IMS, and the other is WV (Ingimundarson; paragraphs 65-72, does disclose a WV, or IMPS, domain and an SIMPLE, or IMS, domain with group commands and messages provided according to addressing and group command protocols),

Ingimundarson does not explicitly disclose, however 3GPP discloses and further wherein, if the message originates from the 3GPP IMS domain, the group command is provided in a message according to one or another addressing protocol including SIP, PRES, IM (3GPP; 1.0 Scope, discloses a message from a IMS domain being provided according to an addressing protocol including SIP).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the IMS domain and group command, as disclosed by Ingimundarson, to include providing the group command in a message according to an addressing protocol including SIP, as disclosed by 3GPP, in order to provide functionality for initiating a session.

Ingimundarson does not explicitly disclose, however Ericcson discloses and if the message originates from the WV domain, the group command is provided in a message according to one or another addressing protocol including CSP (Ericcson; 7.1 CSP, discloses a WV, or IMPS, domain with a group command provided in a message according to an addressing protocol including CSP).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the WV domain and group command, as disclosed by Ingimundarson, to

include providing the group command in a message according to an addressing protocol including CSP, as disclosed by Ericcson, in order to provide a functional addressing protocol for client-server communication.

15. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingimundarson, 3GPP, and Ericcson as applied to Claims 6 and 14 above, and further in view of The Extensible Markup Language (XML) Configuration Access Protocol (XCAP) to Rosenberg (hereinafter " Rosenberg ") (IDS submitted July 19, 2004).

16. As to Claims 7 and 15, Ingimundarson, 3GPP, and Ericcson in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claims 6 and 14.

Ericcson further discloses if the message originates from the 3GPP WV domain, the group command is provided according to the CSP protocol (Ericcson; 7.1 CSP, discloses a WV, or IMPS, domain with a group command provided according to the CSP protocol).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the WV domain and group command, as disclosed by Ingimundarson, to include providing the group command according to the CSP protocol, as disclosed by Ericcson, in order to provide a functional protocol for group commands.

Ingimundarson, 3GPP, and Ericcson do not explicitly disclose, however Rosenberg discloses if the message originates from the 3GPP IMS domain, the group command is provided

according to XCAP (Rosenberg; 1.0 Introduction, discloses an IMS, or SIMPLE, domain with a group command provided according to the XCAP protocol).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the IMS domain and group command, as disclosed by Ingimundarson, to include providing the group command according to the XCAP protocol, as disclosed by Rosenberg, in order to provide a functional protocol for group commands.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIVEK KRISHNAN whose telephone number is (571) 270-5009. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/824,934  
Art Unit: 2145

Page 10

VK

/Jason D Cardone/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145